REMARKS

Claims 1-12 and 26-38 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 7, 10, 26, and 29 have been amended, and claim 38 has been added, to more clearly define the invention. Support for the amendment can be found throughout the specification including at pages 11, 21-24, pages 31-34, pages 40-42, and FIGS 5-7. The Assignee respectfully requests further examination of the application in view of the following. Claims 1-2, 6-8, 10-11, and 26-28 presently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,487,195 issued to Choung *et al.* (hereinafter "Choung") and U.S. Patent No. 6,282,545 issued to Burner *et al.* (hereinafter "Burner"). Claims 1-13 and 26-37 presently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,944,791 issued to Scherpbier *et. al.* (hereinafter "Scherpbier") and Burner. The Assignee respectfully traverses these rejections and requests allowance of all pending claims.

A. Examiner Interview

The Assignee would like to express their appreciation to the Examiner for taking the time to conduct an interview on October 7, 2004. During this interview, the Assignee proposed amendments, and argued that the teachings of cited references applied in the Final Office Action do not show the proposed amendments. In particular that the cited references do not show a system that transmits or displays related information to multiple users. No agreement was reached during the interview. However, the Examiner suggested that amendments may be beneficial in overcoming the cited references.

B. Claims 1-2, 6-8, 10-11, and 26-28 are not obvious in light of Choung and Burner

In rejecting claim 1, the Office Action has noted that "Choung does not explicity teach the step of generating multiple categories of information related to the object..." However, the Office Action asserts, "Burner teaches a method for automatically displaying various metadata

about a web page currently displayed/accessed by a browser (i.e. generating multiple categories of information related to the object...." (Office Action, ¶ 9).

As amended, claim 1, recites:

1. A method for providing collaborative browsing of a communications network that allows multiple users, each with a browser for browsing the network, jointly and generally simultaneously to access objects within the network, the method comprising:
   - associating a browser companion with each of multiple users' respective browsers;
   - **generating multiple categories of information related to the object accessed via a first user's browser**;
   - **transmitting the multiple categories of information related to the object accessed via the first user's browser to** the first user and the other of **multiple users**; and
   - **displaying the multiple categories of information related to the object accessed to** (1) the first user and (2) the other of **the multiple users via their respective associated browser companions**.

(Emphasis Added)

The Assignee respectfully asserts that the "multiple categories of information related to the object" have been interpreted by the Office Action to mean "metadata" from Burner. Assuming that this interpretation of "multiple categories of information related to the object" is correct, an inspection of Burner shows that **Burner only transmits the metadata to a *single* computer**. In stark contrast, claim 1 recites "transmitting the multiple categories...to the first user and the other of multiple users." Thus, even assuming that the Office Action's interpretation is correct, when the Scherpbier reference is combined with the Burner reference, at most it would show a collaborative browsing session wherein the web page is sent to each of the multiple users, while the metadata would only be sent to the first user. Therefore, the combination of these two references is inadequate to show the method of claim 1.

Burner also fails to disclose "displaying the multiple categories of information related to the object accessed to (1) the first user and (2) the other of the multiple users." The Office Action states that Burner teaches generating multiple categories of information related to the object accessed via a first user's browser at 4:66-5:9 and 11:18-34. The relevant portions of Burner state:

> The present invention allows a user to view metadata about a page being viewed via a browser. Specifically, client software executing on the same system as the browser obtains metadata about the site/page being viewed and displays it concurrently with the page being displayed by the browser. This information includes "Where you are" information, suggesting related pages that the user might want to view. In addition, advertisers can request that their ads be displayed to users viewing certain pages or certain types of pages. The following paragraphs provide an overview of the system.
>
> Popup menu 800 allows the user to view various metadata about the web page being displayed by the browser. This data can include, without limitation: ratings, freshness, "sites pointing in," address, page history, stock symbols, number of pages in the site, access speed, link to an online mapping service, telephone number, a data group (based on for example the Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) code), and financial review data. The metadata can also include specialized metadata. An example of specialized metadata is metadata about college web pages, such as enrollment and tuition. Although not shown, popup area 800 can also include ads or ad links. It should be understood that these metadata are provided for purposes of example only and are not intended to limit the scope of the invention. Other implementations of the present invention may include some subset of this metadata or may include additional types of metadata not discussed herein.

Burner teaches that the client software obtains metadata about the site being viewed and displays it with the page being displayed by the browser. The user who views the metadata related to the web page is the same user that viewed the initial web page. Burner does not appear to teach or suggest "displaying the multiple categories of information related to the object accessed to . . . the other of the multiple users" as recited in claim 1. Choung teaches a browser synchronizer that updates its respective web browser with the new web page location information. 7:33-37. The new web page information is not "multiple categories of information," because "Choung does not explicitly teach the step of generating multiple categories of information." (Office Action, ¶ 4). Choung and Burner combined teach obtaining metadata about a website initially viewed by a first user, displaying the metadata only to the first

user, and a browser synchronizer that updates its respective web browser with new web page location information, which is not "multiple categories of information." The references combined do not teach the claim 1 step "displaying the multiple categories of information related to the object accessed to (1) the first user and (2) the other of the multiple users." Assignee respectfully asserts that claim 1 is not rendered obvious by the combination of Choung and Burner because the references combined fail to teach displaying the multiple categories of information to the first user and the other of the multiple users.

Claims 2-6 and 32-37 depend from claim 1 and therefore incorporate all of the steps of the independent claim. 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 4. Consequently, the Assignee respectfully asserts that claims 2-6 and 32-37 are allowable over Choung and Burner for the same reason that claim 1 is allowable.

With respect to claim 7, that claim recites:

> 7. A system for allowing multiple users generally simultaneously to access objects hosted by a remote server over a network, the system comprising:
>
> - an interface for coupling with a first browser, wherein the interface and first browser are loaded on a computer or microprocessor that is coupled to the network;
> - a server that (1) receives from the interface the address of a first portion of the computer network the first browser accesses, (2) communicates information to the interface, (3) **generates multiple data categories related to the received address** and ; (4) **communicates the generated multiple data categories to the interface and one or more browser companions associated with a browser other than the first browser**.
> - a display for showing information received at the interface, wherein the information comprises data associated with the first portion of the computer network; and
> - a user interface for allowing a first user to enter commands for transmission to the server, wherein at least one of the commands comprises a command to initiate a session in which the interface causes at least **a browser companion to display to a second user information associated with the first user's actions**.

(Emphasis Added)

The Assignee respectfully asserts that the "multiple categories of information related to the received address" have apparently been interpreted by the Office Action to mean the "metadata" from Burner. Assuming that this interpretation of "multiple categories of information related to

the object" is correct, an inspection of Burner shows that **Burner only transmits the metadata to a *single* computer**. In stark contrast, claim 7 recites that the "server...communicates the generated categories to the interface and one or more **browser companions associated with a browser other than the first browser**." Thus, even assuming that the Office Action's interpretation is correct, when the Scherpbier reference is combined with the Burner reference, at most it would show a collaborative browsing session wherein the web page is sent to each of the multiple users, while the metadata would only be sent to the first user. Therefore, the combination of these two references is inadequate to show the method of claim 7.

As discussed previously, Choung and Burner combined also do not appear to teach or suggest causing "a browser companion to display to a second user information associated with the first user's actions," *i.e.* generated multiple data categories related to the received address. Assignee asserts that claim 7 is not obvious in light of Choung and Burner for at least this reason. Claims 8 and 9 depend from claim 7 and incorporate all of the features/elements of independent claim 7. 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 4. Consequently, Assignee respectfully asserts that claims 8-9 are not rendered obvious by the combination of Burner and Choung for at least the same reasons as discussed with respect to claim 7.

Claim 10, as amended, recites a server which "upon receipt of the tracking information, generates a list of multiple data categories related to the displayed object for delivery to the second browser for display to a first user of the group of users and one or more other users in the group, other than the first user." As discussed previously, Choung and Burner do not disclose displaying a list of multiple data categories related to the displayed object to one or more other users in the group, other then the first user. Claim 10 is not obvious in light of the proposed combination of Choung and Burner for at least this reason. Claims 11 and 12 depend from claim 10 and incorporate all the features/elements of the independent claim. 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 4. Claims 11 and 12 are not obvious for at least the same reason that claim 10 is not obvious.

Claim 26 recites a server for communicating multiple categories of information to the one or more of the multiple users other than the first user. As discussed above, the combination of Choung and Burner do not disclose communicating multiple categories of information to one or

more of the multiple users other than the first user. Accordingly, Assignee respectfully asserts that Claim 26 is not obvious in light of Choung and Burner for at least this reason. Claims 27-31 depend from claim 26 and incorporate every limitation of the independent claim. 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 4. Claims 27-31, therefore, are not obvious for at least the same reason claim 26 is not obvious.

C. Claims 1-12 and 26-37 are not obvious in light of Scherpbier and Burner

Claims 1-12 and 26-37 are not obvious in light of Scherpbier and Burner. To establish obviousness, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. MPEP § 2143.03. Independent claims 1, 7, 10, and 26 all recite displaying multiple categories of information related to the accessed object to a user or users other than the first user that initially accessed the object. As discussed, Burner does not appear to teach or suggest communicating multiple categories of information to users other than the first user.

In addition, Assignee respectfully asserts that Scherpbier does not appear to teach or suggest transmitting or communicating multiple categories of information to a user other than the first user. Similarly, the Office Action noted that "Scherpbier does not explicitly teach the step of generating multiple categories of information related to the object accessed via a first user's browser." (Office Action, ¶ 9). Consequently Scherpbier does not disclose transmitting or communicating multiple categories of information. The Office Action states that Scherpbier teaches the limitation of "displaying the multiple categories of information related to the object access to (1) the first user and (2) the other of the multiple users via their respective browsers or associated browser companions" at 2:57-3:18. (Office Action, ¶ 9). The relevant portion of Scherpbier states:

> In another aspect, a computer-implemented method is disclosed for allowing a pilot computer to cause a passenger computer, which includes a passenger Web browser, to display a predetermined Web page. The method includes transmitting, at the pilot computer, the uniform resource locator (URL) of the predetermined page to a control site. The control site is a member of the Web, such that the control site can retrieve the predetermined page. Them, at the passenger computer, a code is

> transmitted to the control site and, if the code is valid, an active control is received from the control site. Next, the active control cooperates with the passenger Web browser to download the predetermined Web page from the control site.
>
> In still another aspect, a system is disclosed for allowing a pilot computer to cause a passenger computer including a passenger Web browser to display a predetermined Web page. The system includes, at the pilot computer, logic means for transmitting the uniform resource locator (URL) of the predetermined page to a control site, wherein the control site is a member of the Web. At the control site, logic means are provided fir retrieving the predetermined page, and at the passenger computer logic means are provided for transmitting a code to the control site. Moreover, at the control site logic means determine whether the code is valid and if so, logic means transmit in response thereto an active control to the passenger computer. Additionally, logic means cause the active control to cooperate with the passenger Web browser to download the predetermined Web page from the control site.

Scherpbier discloses causing a passenger computer to display a predetermined web page, which is not "generated" because, as the Office Action acknowledged, "Scherpbier does not explicitly teach the step of generating multiple categories of information." (Office Action, ¶ 9). Burner teaches that the client software obtains metadata about the site being viewed and displays it with the page being displayed by the browser only to the first user. Even if it were accepted that Burner and Scherpbier combined teach obtaining metadata about the site being viewed by a first user, displaying that metadata to the first user, and causing passenger computers to display predetermined web pages, Burner and Scherpbier do not teach transmitting or displaying the multiple categories of information to a user or users other than the first user. Independent claims 1, 7, 10, and 26 all require either transmitting, displaying or communicating multiple categories of information related to the accessed object to the first user and the other of the multiple users. For at least this reason, independent claims 1, 7, 10, and 26 are not obvious in light of the combination of Burner and Scherpbier.

Claims 2-6 and 32-37 depend from claim 1, 8-9 from claim 7, 11-12 from claim 10, and 27-31 from claim 26. Consequently, the dependent claims include all of the limitations of the

independent claims. 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 4. Claims 2-6, 32-37, 11-12, and 27-31 are not obvious in light of Scherpbier and Burner for at least the same reasons claims 1, 7, 10, and 26 are not obvious.

D. New Claim 38 is not obvious in light of Chuong, Scherpbier or Burner

In the relevant portion, claim 38 recites that "the multiple categories of information are selected from the group consisting of: links related to the accessed object, message boards regarding the accessed object, notes regarding the accessed object, commerce related to the accessed object, an internet relay chat related to the accessed object, a bulletin board related to the accessed object, a newsgroup related to the accessed object, a co-browsing link related to the accessed object, and combinations thereof." Assignee respectfully asserts that none of the cited references disclose any of the features described in claim 38. In particular, Burner appears to disclose transmitting metadata, which does not belong to any of the multiple categories of information claimed. Morever, Chuong and Scherpbier appear to teach only collaborative browsing systems which do not provide any categories of information related to the object or address accessed to the first user or any of the other users. Thus, Assignee respectfully asserts that claim 38 is allowable over the cited references of record.

CONCLUSION

To the extent that there are any remaining issues in this application, the undersigned invites the Examiner to conduct a telephonic interview to resolve such issues. If not, the Assignee respectfully requests allowance of the pending claims.

The Assignee, therefore, respectfully requests the issuance of a notice of allowance for all claims pending in the present application. Assignee believes that no fee is due outside of those provided for in the accompanying documents; however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any required fee or credit any overpayment, associated with this response to Jones Day's Deposit Account No. 502724, ref: 061143-605010.

Respectfully submitted,

Troy A. Van Aacken
Registration No. 50,847

JONES DAY
Customer No. 36587
Phone: 404-521-3939
Fax: 404-581-8330
e-mail: tavanaacken@jonesday.com

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the date shown below.

Betty Smith — October 8, 2004
Betty Smith — Date